

REMARKS:

Claims 1-35 are currently pending in the subject Application.

Claims 1-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,014,644 to Erickson ("*Erickson*").

Claim 8 is currently amended to correct a typographical error.

The Applicant respectfully submits that all of the Applicant's arguments and amendments are without *prejudice* or *disclaimer*. In addition, the Applicant has merely discussed example distinctions from the cited prior art. Other distinctions may exist, and as such, the Applicant reserves the right to discuss these additional distinctions in a future Response or on Appeal, if appropriate. The Applicant further respectfully submits that by not responding to additional statements made by the Examiner, the Applicant does not acquiesce to the Examiner's additional statements. The example distinctions discussed by the Applicant are considered sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejections. In addition, the Applicant reserves the right to pursue broader claims in this Application or through a continuation patent application. No new matter has been added.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 1-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Erickson*.

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Erickson* fails to disclose each and every limitation recited by Claims 1-35. The Applicant further submits that Claims 1-35 patentably distinguish over *Erickson*. Thus, the Applicant respectfully traverse the Examiners rejection of Claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Erickson*.

***Erickson* Fails to Disclose, Teach, or Suggest Various Limitations Recited in Applicant's Claims**

For example, with respect to independent Claim 1, this claim recites:

An **electronic commerce system for order acceleration through user document reuse**, the system comprising:

one or more **document repositories** operable to **store a plurality of user documents used during a first electronic commerce transaction**;

a global content directory including a plurality of classes organized in a hierarchy, each class **categorizing the user documents** and associated with one or more attributes of the **user documents categorized in the class**, at least one of the classes having one or more associated pointers that identify **one or more document repositories**;

a search interface associated with the global content directory, the search interface operable to communicate a search query to one or more document repositories identified by one of the pointers **to search the documents stored in the document repositories**;

a **security module operable to decrypt the user documents to allow a user to access the user documents**; and

an intelligence module operable to update one or more sections in the user documents with current information associated with a **second electronic commerce transaction**. (Emphasis Added).

In addition, *Erickson* fails to disclose each and every limitation of independent Claims 11, 23, and 35.

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Erickson* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest independent Claim 1 limitations regarding an “**electronic commerce system for order acceleration through user document reuse**” and in particular *Erickson* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest independent Claim 1 limitations regarding “one or more **document repositories** operable to **store a plurality of user documents used during a first electronic commerce transaction**”. In particular, the Examiner equates the “**user documents**” recited in independent Claim 1 with a “**database entry**” purportedly disclosed in *Erickson*. (8 January 2008 Office Action, Page 2). In contrast the “**user documents**” recited in independent Claim 1 are **user documents used during a first electronic commerce transaction** and in addition the search interface associated with the global content directory is operable **to search the documents stored in the document repositories** and the **security module allows a user to access the decrypted user documents**.

In response to the Applicant's request that the Examiner point to the portion or portions of *Erickson* that contain the alleged term "**database entry**", the Examiner acknowledges that *Erickson* does not in fact contain the term "**database entry**", that is, the term "**database entry**" does not in fact exist in *Erickson*. (8 January 2008 Office Action, Page 3). (Emphasis Added). In fact the Examiner asserts, with respect to the "term 'database entry', an '**entry**' is a **database record** or **data in a field** or a **user document**." (8 January 2008 Office Action, Page 3). (Emphasis Added). However, just like the term "**database entry**", which the Examiner acknowledges does not in fact exist in *Erickson*, the terms "**entry**", "**database record**", "**data in a field**", and "**user document**" also do not in fact exist in *Erickson*. (8 January 2008 Office Action, Page 3). (Emphasis Added).

The Applicant respectfully submits that a prior art reference (here *Erickson*) anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 **only if each and every element of a claimed invention is identically shown** in that single reference (here *Erickson*). MPEP § 2131. (Emphasis Added). With respect to the subject Application, the Examiner acknowledges that the term "**database entry**" does not in fact exist in *Erickson*, therefore each and every element of Applicant's claimed invention is not shown in *Erickson*. In addition, just like the term "**database entry**", which the Examiner acknowledges does not in fact exist in *Erickson*, the terms "**entry**", "**database record**", "**data in a field**", and "**user document**" also do not in fact exist in *Erickson*. Accordingly, *Erickson* fails to identically disclose "**user documents**", as recited in independent Claim 1. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to *Erickson* because *Erickson* fails to identically disclose the "**user documents**", or even the terms "**entry**", "**database record**", "**data in a field**", and "**user document**". The Applicant further respectfully submits that these distinctions alone are sufficient to patentably distinguish independent Claim 1 from *Erickson*.

The Applicant further respectfully submits that *Erickson* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest independent Claim 1 limitations regarding a "**first electronic commerce transaction**" and a "**second electronic commerce transaction**", because, among other things, ***Erickson fails to teach, suggest, or even hint at any transactional aspect of***

electronic commerce. For example, *Erickson* is solely concerned with a **bidding process**, that is, ***Erickson's method stops prior to any transactional phase***, as evidenced by the Table in column 16, which describes *Erickson's* process:

ACTION	PERFORMED BY
Submit Company Classification, and Product Information	Buyer and/or Suppliers
Maintain Global Database/Update Local Database	Service Provider/Buyer and/or Supplier
Browse Supplier Database and Assemble Supplier List	Buyer
Create Data cast Object Using Supplier List and Other Information	Buyer
Send Data cast Message to Suppliers	Buyer or Service Provider
Send Reminders to Suppliers	Buyer or Service Provider
Respond to Data cast Message	Suppliers
Collect Supplier Responses	Buyer or Service Provider
Analyze Supplier Responses	Buyer

The Applicant respectfully submits that *Erickson's* process ends at the step “**Analyze Supplier Responses**,” which is prior to any transactional phase. In fact, *Erickson* fails to teach, suggest, or even hint at any system, method, or software related to or concerning **any aspect of a transactional phase of electronic commerce**, as recited in independent Claim 1. Furthermore, *Erickson* is silent with regard to any user document used in any transactional phase of electronic commerce, because, as discussed above, *Erickson* fails to relate to or be concerned with **any aspect of a transactional phase of electronic commerce**.

In addition, the Examiner also states:

Applicant asserts that the prior [sic] does not store transactional user documents. The examiner does not concur. Applicant is reading limitations into the claim that do not exist. First, the term “**transactional user document**” does not exist in applicant’s specification, so there is no special definition for this term.

(8 January 2008 Office Action, Page 3). (Emphasis Added). The Applicant respectfully disagrees and respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 limitations recite “one or more **document repositories** operable to **store a plurality of user documents used**

during a first electronic commerce transaction", a "global content directory including a plurality of classes organized in a hierarchy, each class **categorizing the user documents** and associated with one or more attributes of the **user documents categorized in the class**, at least one of the classes having one or more associated pointers that identify **one or more document repositories**", and a **"security module operable to decrypt the user documents to allow a user to access the user documents"**. As clearly shown in independent Claim 1 and contrary to the Examiner's assertion, independent Claim 1 limitations provide for **"user documents"**. The term **"user documents"** is clearly a limitation in independent Claim 1 and contrary to the Examiner's assertion, does in fact exist in independent Claim 1. In addition, the term **"user documents"** does in fact exist in Applicant's specification.

As one example, among many examples, Applicant's Specification describes electronic commerce, or "e-commerce," as involving a **"matching"** phase and a **"transactional"** phase. Referring to Figure 1, during the matching phase, a buyer 20 may search for a suitable product offered by one or more sellers 30, identify the most suitable seller 30, and contact that seller 30 to enter the transactional phase. During the **transactional phase**, the buyer 20 and seller 30 may negotiate a contract for the sale of the product and generate a legal document embodying the terms of the negotiated contract. (see Applicant's Specification at least at, Page. 6, Line 28, through Page. 7, Line 6.) The **transactional phase** involves the creation and use of one or more documents between buyer 20 and seller 30. (see Applicant's Specification at least at, Page. 8, Lines 3-4.) Applicant's global content directory (GCD) 42 provides a way for **transactional documents** to become accessible to buyers 20 and sellers 30, so that negotiation and document creation costs are reduced. For example, without the use of GCD 42 in the **transactional phase**, buyer 20 may have to create new documents each time buyer enters into a new transaction with a seller 30 and then negotiate the legal and business points with seller 30, even though buyer 20 and seller 30 have had previous interaction, because there is no stored record of previous transactions. (see Applicant's Specification at least at, Page. 8, Lines 4-25)

Accordingly, *Erickson* fails to identically disclose “**user documents**”, as recited in independent Claim 1. Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation of independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to *Erickson* because *Erickson* fails to identically disclose the “**user documents**” as recited in independent Claim 1. The Applicant further respectfully submits that these distinctions alone are sufficient to patentably distinguish independent Claim 1 from *Erickson*.

The Office Action Fails to Properly Establish a *Prima Facie* case of Anticipation over *Erickson*

The Applicant respectfully submits that the allegation in the present Office Action that *Erickson* discloses all of the claimed features is respectfully traversed. Further, it is noted that the Office Action provides no concise explanation as to how *Erickson* is considered to anticipate all of the limitations in Claims 1-35. ***A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if each and every element of a claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference.*** MPEP § 2131. (Emphasis Added).

With respect to the subject application, the Examiner has not adequately supported the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, because the Examiner has not shown how each and every element of the Applicant claimed invention is identically shown in *Erickson*. For example, the Examiner asserts that “**user documents**”, in independent Claim 1 is somehow equivalent to a **database entry**. (8 January 2008 Office Action, Page 3). The Applicant respectfully disagrees and further respectfully requests clarification as to how the Examiner arrives at this conclusion.

The Applicant respectfully point out that “it is incumbent upon the examiner to identify wherein each and every facet of the claimed invention is disclosed in the applied reference.” Ex parte Levy, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1461, 1462 (Pat. & Tm. Off. Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1990). The Applicant respectfully submits that ***the Office Action has failed to establish a prima facie case of anticipation in Claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to Erickson because Erickson fails to identically disclose each and every***

element of the Applicant claimed invention, arranged as they are in Applicant claims.

The Applicant's Claims are Patentable over *Erickson*

With respect to independent Claims 11, 23, and 35 these claims are considered patentably distinguishable over *Erickson* for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1.

Furthermore, with respect to dependent claims 2-10, 12-22, and 24-34: Claims 2-10 depend from independent Claim 1; Claims 12-22 depend from independent Claim 11; and dependent Claims 24-34 depend from independent Claim 23 and are also considered patentably distinguishable over *Erickson*. Thus, dependent Claims 2-10, 12-22, and 24-34 are considered to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason of depending from an allowable claim.

Thus, for at least the reasons set forth herein, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-35 are not anticipated by *Erickson*. The Applicant further respectfully submits that Claims 1-35 are in condition for allowance. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be reconsidered and that Claims 1-35 be allowed.

THE LEGAL STANDARD FOR ANTICIPATION REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

The following sets forth the legal standards for "anticipation."

The events that can lead to anticipation can be divided into the following seven categories, all defined by statute:

1. Prior Knowledge: The invention was publicly known in the United States before the patentee invented it.

2. Prior Use: The invention was publicly used in the United States either (i) before the patentee invented it; or (ii) more than one year before he filed his patent application.

3. Prior Publication: The invention was described in a printed publication anywhere in the world either (i) before the patentee invented it; or (ii) more than one year before he filed his patent application.

4. Prior Patent: The invention was patented in another patent anywhere in the world either (i) before the patentee invented it; or (ii) more than one year before he filed his application.

5. On Sale: The invention was on sale in the United States more than one year before the patentee filed his application.

6. Prior Invention: The invention was invented by another person in the United States before the patentee invented it, and that other person did not abandon, suppress or conceal the invention.

7. Prior U.S. Patent: The invention was described in a patent granted on a patent application filed in the United States before the patentee made the invention.

Each of those seven events has its own particular requirements, but they all have the following requirements in common:

1. Anticipation must be shown by clear and convincing evidence.
2. If one prior art reference completely embodies the same process or product as any claim, the product or process of that claim is anticipated by the prior art, and that claim is invalid. To decide whether anticipation exists, one must consider each of the elements recited in the claim and determine whether all of them are found in the particular item alleged to be anticipating prior art.
3. There is no anticipation unless every one of those elements is found in a *single* prior publication, prior public use, prior invention, prior patent, prior knowledge or

prior sale. One may not combine two or more items of prior art to make out an anticipation. One should, however, take into consideration, not only what is expressly disclosed or embodied in the particular item of prior art, but also what inherently occurred in its practice.

4. There cannot be an accidental or unrecognized anticipation. A prior duplication of the claimed invention that was accidental, or unrecognized, unappreciated, and incidental to some other purpose is not an invalidating anticipation.

Those four requirements must be kept in mind and applied to each kind of anticipation in issue. The following additional requirements apply to some categories of anticipation.

1. Prior Knowledge: An invention is anticipated if it was known by others in the United States before it was invented by the patentee. "Known," in this context, means known to the public. Private knowledge, secret knowledge or knowledge confined to a small, limited group is not necessarily an invalidating anticipation. Things that were known to the public only outside the United States are not invalidating anticipation.

2. Prior Use: An invention is anticipated if it was used by others before it was invented by the patentee, or more than one year before the patentee filed his patent application. "Use," in this context, means a public use.

3. Prior Publication: A patent is invalid if the invention defined by the Claims was described in a printed publication before it was invented by the patentee or more than one year prior to the filing date of his application. For a publication to constitute an anticipation of an invention, it must be capable, when taken in conjunction with the knowledge of people of ordinary skill in the art, of placing the invention in the possession of the reader. The disclosure must be enabling and meaningful. In determining whether the disclosure is complete, enabling, and meaningful, one should take into account what would have been within the knowledge of a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time, and one may consider other publications that shed light on the knowledge such a person would have had.

4. Prior Patent: If the invention defined by the claims was patented in the United States or a foreign country, either before it was invented by the inventor or more than one year before the inventor filed his patent application, then the invention was anticipated. The effective date for this type of anticipation is the date on which two things co-existed: (i) the owner of the referenced patent had the right to enforce that patent; and (ii) the reference patent was available to the public. What was "patented" in the reference patent is determined by what is defined by its claims, interpreted in the light of the general description.

5. On Sale: A patent is invalid if the invention claimed in it was on sale in the United States more than one year prior to the application filing date.

6. Prior Invention: If the invention defined by the claims was invented by another person, in the United States, before it was invented by the inventor, and that other person did not abandon, suppress, or conceal the invention, the invention lacks novelty. A prior invention, even if put in physical form and shown to produce the desired result, is not an invalidating anticipation unless some steps were taken to make it public. However, it is not necessary that the inventor had knowledge of that prior invention.

7. Prior U.S. Application: A patent is invalid for lack of novelty if the invention defined by the claims was described in a United States patent issued on a patent application filed by another person before the invention was made by the inventor. The effective date of a prior application for purposes of this issue is the date on which it was filed in the United States. Foreign-filed patent applications do not apply. If the issued United States patent claims the benefit of more than one United States application, its effective date as an anticipation is the filing date of the first United States application that discloses the invention claimed in that referenced patent.

Experimental Use Exception: The law recognizes that it is beneficial to permit the inventor the time and opportunity to develop his invention. As such there is an "experimental use" exception to the "public use" and "on sale" rules. Even though the invention was publicly used or on sale, more than one year prior to the application filing date, that does not invalidate the patent, provided the principal purpose was experimenta-

tion rather than commercial benefit. If the primary purpose was experimental, it does not matter that the public used the invention or that the inventor incidentally derived profit from it.

When a public use or sale is shown, the burden is on the inventor to come forward with evidence to support the experimental use exception. Only experimentation by or under the control of the inventor qualifies for this exception. Experimentation by a third party, for its own purposes, does not qualify for this exception. Once the invention leaves the inventor's control, its use is a public one, even if further experimentation takes place.

The experimentation must relate to the claimed features of the invention. And it must be for the purpose of technological improvement, not commercial exploitation. If any commercial exploitation does occur, it must be merely incidental to the primary purpose of experimentation. A test done primarily for marketing, and only incidentally for technological improvement, is a public use.

CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Although the Applicant believes no fees are deemed to be necessary; the undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayments, to **Deposit Account No. 500777**. If an extension of time is necessary for allowing this Response to be timely filed, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) to the extent necessary. Any fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time should be charged to **Deposit Account No. 500777**.

Please link this application to Customer No. 53184 so that its status may be checked via the PAIR System.

Respectfully submitted,

8 April 2008
Date

/Steven J. Laureanti/signed
Steven J. Laureanti, Registration No. 50,274

BOOTH UDALL, PLC
1155 W. Rio Salado Pkwy., Ste. 101
Tempe AZ, 85281
214.636.0799 (mobile)
480.830.2700 (office)
480.830.2717 (fax)
steven@boothudall.com

CUSTOMER NO. 53184